

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
10845 Griffith Peak Drive  
Suite 600  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89135  
Telephone: (702) 792-3773  
Facsimile: (702) 792-9002

1 ERIC W. SWANIS, ESQ.  
2 Nevada Bar No. 6840  
3 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
4 10845 Griffith Peak Drive, Suite 600  
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89135  
6 Telephone: (702) 792-3773  
7 Facsimile: (702) 792-9002  
8 Email: [swanise@gtlaw.com](mailto:swanise@gtlaw.com)

9 CASEY SHPALL, ESQ.\*  
10 \*Admitted Pro Hac Vice  
11 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
12 1144 15th Street, Suite 3300  
13 Denver, Colorado 80202  
14 Telephone: (303) 572-6500  
15 Email: [shpallc@gtlaw.com](mailto:shpallc@gtlaw.com)

16 *Counsel for Defendants*

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

JORDAN LYNCH,

Plaintiff,

v.

C. R. BARD, INC. and BARD  
PERIPHERAL VASCULAR, INC,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:20-cv-00616-KJD-BNW

**STIPULATION TO STAY DISCOVERY  
AND ALL PRETRIAL DEADLINES**

Plaintiff Jordan Lynch (“Plaintiff”) and Defendants C. R. Bard, Inc. and Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc. (“Defendants” and collectively with Plaintiff, the “Parties”), pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c) and (d) and LR IA 6-2, respectfully request that this Court temporarily stay discovery and all pretrial deadlines until **August 29, 2020** while the Parties pursue settlement discussions. In support thereof, the Parties state as follows:

///

1           1.       This case was part of the Multi-District Litigation proceeding *In re:*  
2       *Bard IVC Filters Product Liability Litigation*, pending before Senior Judge David  
3       Campbell of the District of Arizona.

4           2.       Plaintiff alleges experiencing complications following the implantation  
5       of a Bard Inferior Vena Cava (“IVC”) filter, a prescription medical device. She has  
6       asserted three strict products liability counts (manufacturing defect, information defect  
7       (failure to warn) and design defect), six negligence counts (design, manufacture,  
8       failure to recall/retrofit, failure to warn, negligent misrepresentation and negligence  
9       per se), two breach of warranty counts (express and implied), two counts sounding in  
10      fraud (fraudulent misrepresentation and fraudulent concealment), an unfair and  
11      deceptive trade practices count, and a claim for punitive damages.

12          3.       Defendants deny the allegations contained in the Complaint.

13          4.       After four years, the completion of general issue discovery, and the  
14      conduct of three bellwether trials, Judge Campbell ordered that cases, which have not  
15      settled or are not close to settling, be transferred or remanded to the appropriate  
16      jurisdictions around the country for case-specific discovery and trial. As a part of that  
17      process, he established a “track” system, wherein certain cases were placed on tracks  
18      either to finalize settlement paperwork, continue settlement negotiations, or be  
19      remanded or transferred.

20          5.       This case was transferred to this Court on March 31, 2020 because at the  
21      time it was not close to settling. But, since that date, the Parties have engaged in further  
22      settlement discussions. The Parties believe that a stay is necessary to conserve their  
23      resources and attention so that they may attempt to resolve this case and those of two  
24      other plaintiffs represented by Plaintiff’s counsel with cases pending before this Court.

25          6.       Accordingly, the Parties request that this Court issue an order staying  
26      discovery and pretrial deadlines until August 29, 2020 to allow the Parties time to  
27      continue to engage in settlement discussions. This will further facilitate settlement  
28      discussions and prevent unnecessary expenditures of the Parties and judicial

resources as well as place this case on a similar “track” as the MDL cases Judge Campbell determined should continue settlement dialogue.

7. A district court has broad discretion over pretrial discovery rulings. *Crawford-El v. Britton*, 523 U.S. 574, 598 (1998); *accord, Republic of Ecuador v. Hinchee*, 741 F.3d 1185, 1188-89 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2013); *Thermal Design, Inc. v. Am. Soc’y of Heating, Refrigerating & Air-Conditioning Engineers, Inc.*, 755 F.3d 832, 837 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2014); *see also, Cook v. Kartridg Pak Co.*, 840 F.2d 602, 604 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988) (“A district court must be free to use and control pretrial procedure in furtherance of the orderly administration of justice.”).

8. Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26(c) and 26(d), a court may limit the scope of discovery or control its sequence. *Britton*, 523 U.S. at 598. Although settlement negotiations do not automatically excuse a party from its discovery obligations, the parties can seek a stay prior to the cutoff date. *Sofo v. Pan-American Life Ins. Co.*, 13 F.3d 239, 242 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1994); *see also, Wichita Falls Office Assocs. v. Banc One Corp.*, 978 F.2d 915, 918 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993) (finding that a “trial judge’s decision to curtail discovery is granted great deference,” and noting that the discovery had been pushed back a number of times because of pending settlement negotiations).

9. Facilitating the efforts of parties to resolve their disputes weighs in favor of granting a stay. In *Coker v. Dowd*, 2:13-cv-0994-JCM-NJK, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 201845, at \*2-3 (D. Nev. July 8, 2013), the parties requested a 60-day stay to facilitate ongoing settlement negotiations and permit them to mediate global settlement. The Court granted the stay, finding the parties would be prejudiced if required to move forward with discovery at that time and a stay would potentially prevent an unnecessary complication in the case. *Id.* at \*3. Similarly, the Parties in the present case are engaged in ongoing comprehensive settlement negotiations with Plaintiff and the other two plaintiffs represented by Plaintiff’s counsel.

///

10. The Parties agree that the relief sought herein is necessary to handle the case in the most economical fashion yet allow sufficient time to schedule and complete discovery if necessary, consistent with the scheduling obligations of counsel. The relief sought in this Motion is not being requested for delay, but so that justice may be done.

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff and Defendants respectfully request the Court's approval of this stipulation to stay discovery and all pretrial deadlines until **August 29, 2020** to allow the Parties to conduct ongoing settlement negotiations.

**IT IS SO STIPULATED**

Respectfully submitted on August 5, 2020.

WENDT LAW FIRM, P.C.

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

By: /s/ Samuel M. Wendt

By: /s/ Eric W. Swanis

SAMUEL M. WENDT, ESQ.\*

ERIC W. SWANIS, ESQ.

*\*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

Nevada Bar No. 6840

[sam@wendtlaw.com](mailto:sam@wendtlaw.com)

[swanise@gtlaw.com](mailto:swanise@gtlaw.com)

4717 Grand Avenue, Suite 130  
Kansas City, Missouri 64112

10845 Griffith Peak Drive, Suite 600  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89135

PETER C. WETHERALL, ESQ.  
WETHERALL GROUP LTD.

CASEY SHPALL, ESQ.\*

*\*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

Nevada Bar No. 4414

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

[pwetherall@wetherallgroup.com](mailto:pwetherall@wetherallgroup.com)

1144 15th Street, Suite 3300

9345 West Sunset Road, Suite 100

Denver, Colorado 80202

Las Vegas, Nevada 89148

Telephone: (303) 572-6500

Email: [shpallc@gtlaw.com](mailto:shpallc@gtlaw.com)

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

*Counsel for Defendants*

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**BRENDA WEKSLER**

**United States Magistrate Judge**

**Dated this 6th of August 2020.**